

## REMARKS

The copending applications section of the application has been amended to include serial numbers for pending applications. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct informalities.

Claims 1-41 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected by the Office under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 21-41 have been added. Claims 2-7 and 14 have been amended for purposes of grammatical consistency.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection by the Office under §112 to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The amendment to claim 1 to overcome the § 112 rejection does not effect the breadth of claim 1 or its dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites a method for synchronizing to a transport stream. The Office indicates that when broadly interpreted, this is disclosed by Anderson and Jong. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Anderson and Jong disclose parsing transport packets and synchronizing to video and audio clocks. No where does Anderson or Jong disclose synchronizing to a transport stream as recited in claim 1. It is well known, and supported by the recited art (see Anderson column 3, lines 13-28), and the Applicant's specification, that a transport stream is a specific-type stream data. Within a transport stream are transport packets, where each transport packet can have header and payload information. Neither transport packets, transport packet headers, nor transport packet data are by themselves a data stream. Therefore, the parsing of transport packets, as disclosed by Anderson and Jong, to retrieve specific data does not constitute synchronizing to a transport stream. In other words, the data stored within a transport packet is not a transport stream, therefore, the parsing of data within a transport stream, or recovering of clocks transmitted within the data of a transport stream do not constitute a method of

synchronizing to a transport stream as recited in claim 1. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under § 102 is respectfully requested, and its allowance solicited.

Because claim 1 is in condition for allowance, so are its dependent claims. In addition, the claims depending from claim 1 provide additional non-obvious features. For example, claim 8 recites one of the unknown features to be a bit ordering. No such feature is disclosed by Anderson or Jong. Claim 9-13 disclose additional unknown features not disclosed by Anderson or Jong. Claim 14 recites that identifying includes determining if a framer is locked to the transport stream. No step of identifying that includes this feature is disclosed.

Claim 20 has been rejection under § 102 as being anticipated by Anderson or Jong. Claim 20 recites a method for synchronizing to a transport stream. The Office indicates that when broadly interpreted, this is disclosed by Anderson and Jong. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.


Anderson and Jong disclose parsing transport packets and synchronizing to video and audio clocks. No where does Anderson or Jong disclose synchronizing to a transport stream. It is well known, and supported by the recited art (see Anderson column 3, lines 13-28), and the Applicant's specification, that a transport stream is a specific-type stream data. Within a transport stream are transport packets, where each transport packet can have header and payload information. Neither transport packets, transport packet headers, nor transport packet data are by themselves a data stream. Therefore, the parsing of transport packets, as disclosed by Anderson and Jong, to retrieve specific data does not constitute synchronizing to a transport stream. In other words, the data stored within a transport packet is not a transport stream, therefore, the parsing of data within a transport stream, or recovering of clocks transmitted within the data of a transport stream do not constitute a method of synchronizing to a transport stream as recited in claim 20. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under § 102 is respectfully requested, and its allowance solicited.

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicant(s) would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to issue a formal Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

7-2-03  
Date

  
J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 29567  
Austin, Texas 78755-9567  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)